Smith's Report

Number 23 May 1995

Bradley R. Smith
P.O. Box 3267
Visalia CA 93278

T: 209.627.8757
F: 209.733.2563

Friend:

I know! I killed Smith's Report two months ago! So what's this? After I killed SR I said I was going to keep you informed monthly of what's going on here. If I'm going to write you monthly, what am I going to call the letter I write? I've got to call it something. How are people going to identify it? That-thing-Smith-writes-once-a-month? Why not call it, well -- Smith's Report?

I needed to make fundamental changes here, because fundamental changes have occurred in my life and with how I can handle this work, which I feel obligated to do. I didn't have to kill Smith's Report. I had to make the changes. They say consistency is a primary requirement of a newsletter. On the surface, consistency doesn't appear to be my strong point. At the same time, here I am, after an eleven-year revisionist escapade, eager to get on with the work.

The Campus Project.

After bemoaning the fact that the Campus Project had been undercut irreversibly for the 1994 / 1995 school year, toward the end of March I received some unexpected funding for it. I suggested as much in the letter for April that you should have received. It was very late in the season, but we managed to pull off a substantial coup nevertheless.

The contributor suggested she could pay for running perhaps three ads at mid-level colleges. The cost would average perhaps $150 per ad. We would use the same ad I submitted in the 1993 / 1994 season with such tremendous results -- "A Revisionist Challenge to the U.S. Holocaut Memorial Museum."

I was concerned that I might submit the ad to three campus papers, say, that all might reject it, that it might take 10 days, two weeks or longer for me to be certain of the rejections, and by then we would be too far behind the curve to have an effective project for the season.

I countered with the idea of submitting the ad, along with a cover letter, to some 200 mid-level colleges. The cover would ask the advertising manager to inform me how much it would cost to place the ad in her paper and the earliest possible date she could run it, and the mechanical width of her paper's columns. I would offer to send photo-ready copy, reduced or enlarged to fit her format, together with a check for the full cost of the ad immediately upon receipt of the necessary information.

My contributor was worried that we might receive too many offers to run the ad, that it would exceed her budget. What would we do if we got positive responses from 20 or even more papers? I told her not to worry, that The Lobby had spent so much collective time and money over the last four years to convince campus editors to refuse my that I wouldn't expect a substantial response to the package. Anything we got would be effective, and quite a surprise to our friends in The Lobby. She said I might get a surprise myself, that from her reading, people are more interested in hearing what revisionists have to say today than they were even two years ago.

While the package would be addressed to the advertising manager, it would get to all the editors and to their editorial staffs as well, even if it never saw the light of day in their papers. Along with the ad I would enclose an opinion piece on how my whole life I have watched Jews forwarding intellectual freedom for Americans and how mainline Jewish organizations have turned their backs on their own tradition in this country and now argue against open debate and a free press.

This was an easy project to do. I had only to write the cover letter, print 200 copies of it and the ad, print out the address labels for the colleges, stuff the envelopes and send them on their way. I didn't even have to write any checks. Magaly took care of the whole project in one afternoon.

This is the essay / advertisement we're talking about. It's been seen and most likely read by perhaps 150,000 college students, faculty and administrators during March and April of this year.

A REVISIONIST CHALLENGE TO THE U.S. HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL MUSEUM

By Bradley R. Smith

This ad does not claim "the Holocaust never happened." Those who say it does want to muddy the issue. This is what the ad does claim: The U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum displays no convincing proof whatever of homicidal gassing chambers, and no proof that even one individual was "gassed" *in a German program of "genocide."*

The question, then, is not, "Did the Holocaust happen?" The question is: If there were no gas chambers, ***what was the Holocaust?***

This Museum promotes the charge that the Germans murdered the Jews of Europe in homicidal gassing chambers. It therefore has a ***moral obligation*** to demonstrate that the charge is true. Those who contend it is more important to be sensitive than truthful about whether or not the gas chambers existed debase America's old civil virtures of free inquiry and open debate, and they betray the ideal of the university itself. For the benefit of whom?

What are the facts?

The Museum's "proof" for a gas chamber at Birkenau is a plastic model imagined by a Polish artiste. A plastic copy of a metal door is displayed as "proof" of a homicidal gas chamber at Maidanek. And, incredibly, the Museum has simply dropped the Auschwitz gas chamber, the basement room visited yearly by hundreds of thousands of tourists in Poland.

There is no mention of the alleged gas chambers at Buchenwald or even at Dachau, where after World War II American G.I.s and German civilians were assured that more than 200,000 victims were "gassed and burned."

The notion that eyewitness testimony, given under highly politicized and emotional circumstances, is prima facie true, was refuted by the **Israeli Supreme Court** when it acquitted John Demjanjuk of being "Ivan the Terrible." The Israeli Court found that eyewitnesses who testified that Demjanjuk operated "gas chambers" could not be believed!

Deborah Lipstadt argues in her much-praised *Denying the Holocaust,* that revisionists ["deniers"] should not be debated because there *can not be* another side to the gas chamber story. This is where revisionism displays its strength. Revisionist theory, resting only on facts, can be disproved. Exterminationist theory, having fallen into the hands of cultists, must be "believed."

I'm not in disagreement with Ms. Lipstadt and her *clique* on the gas chamber controversy because they may be Zionists or Jews. That's disingenuous. I'm in disagreement with her over the fact that she argues against "light of day," our understanding that in a free society *all* ideas are best illuminated in the light shed by open debate

The Museum is so confident no one will challenge its gas-chamber gimcrackery that it even claims to have found a new "death camp" gas chamber. Proof? The uncorroborated fantasies of one man pandering to the victims of Holocaust-survivor-syndrome. **The Museum's historian doesn't even know where the place was!** It "may have been" near Giessen. "May have been?" That's the best historical writing $200 million can buy?

When I challenge such gas-chamber vaporings I understand I'm going to be slandered as an antisemite by true believers representing the Holocaust Lobby. These quasi-religious Holocaust zealots claim that because of the purity of their own feelings about the Jewish experience during World War Two, mine must be soiled when I express doubt in what they preach as "truth."

Yet not even Winston Churchill in his six-volume history of World War Two, or Dwight D. Eisenhower in his memoirs, made reference to homicidal gassing chambers. How do the Holocaust Lobby and its Museum explain that?

Intellectuals who do not believe that intellectual freedom is worth the while on this historical issue, should ask themselves why they believe it's worth the while on *any* historical issue. Then they should explain their answer to the rest of us.

The Operation and Technique of the Museum

The Museum's exhibit technique is a mixture of sinister suggestion and dishonest omission. Example: the first display confronting visitors beginning the Museum tour is a wall-sized photograph of American soldiers looking at corpses smoldering on a pyre. The context in which you see the photo suggests that the dead pictured in it are murdered Jews.

Were the prisoners killed or did they die of typhus or some other disease during the last terrible weeks of the war? Autopsies made by Allied medical personnel found inmates died of disease. Not one was found to have been "gassed." All such relevant information is omitted from this exhibit. We don't even know that the dead pictured in the photograph are Jews!

Unable to judge the significance of the photograph, and not wanting to believe the Museum would mislead you, you are moved to accept the false and manipulative suggestion that it somehow represents the "genocide" of the European Jews.

Call the Museum! Find Out For Yourself!

I'm willing to be convinced I'm wrong about the gas chambers. Authentic physical remains or wartime-generated documents would do the trick. I say the Museum displays neither. CALL THE MUSEUM! FIND OUT FOR YOURSELF! The telephone number is (202) 488 0400. Ask which (specific) Museum exhibits display proof gas chambers really existed. Have this (or any) newspaper publish the result. Then we'll all see what's what.

Special pleaders imply that to investigate the gas chamber stories in the light of day will be harmful to Jews. *I challenge this bigoted insinuation! Free inquiry will **benefit** Jews--for* exactly the reasons it benefits us all. In any case, why should it not?

COMMITTEE FOR OPEN DEBATE ON THE HOLOCAUST (CODOH) is not a membership organization and is not affiliated with any political group or organization. Our goal is to promote free inquiry and open debate, without which intellectual freedom can not exist. To those who ask, "Why challenge the Holocaust Museum?" we reply--***Why not challenge the Holocaust Museum?***

We are the only ones pointing out the falsehoods and misrepresentations surrounding the Museum and the lack of integrity of those who represent it. Every intellectual who visits the Museum, and particularly historians, should point out these facts to you--yet none dare. Only CODOH! Only CODOH dares to challenge the taboo against challenging the Museum!

Help us monitor this growing national controversy. Clip the stories run in your campus and off-campus newspaper and send them to us. Include the name of the paper and the date the story ran. In return, we'll update you on the continuing controversy. Address information to:

CODOH: PO Box 3267 Visalia CA 93278 Tel/Fax: (209) 733 2653

I was more than a little surprised by the reaction we got to the package. Ad managers at 44 (forty-four!) campus newspapers offered to run the ad. My contributor had had a better feeling for the situation this time than I'd had. It's what I call a happy learning experience. The downside was that we were facing a $6,000 and maybe $7,000 promotional bill when the initial budget was to be less that $1,000.

Not to worry, however. One by one, as word of the project got around, the ad managers, editors, faculty advisors and no doubt school administrations began to hear from, I suppose, the Very Best People, who suggested in the persuasive way they have for suggesting such things, that it would be very bad to run the ads and very good to suppress them. Which is what happened in many instances.

Nevertheless, at least 17 (seventeen!) colleges and universities ran the Museum ad. At some campuses where I was offered space, I was too late and simply missed the last issue. Some papers had only one more issue to print and didn't want to run the ad because there would be no chance to run reactions to it. One paper in Missouri forgot to insert the ad and apologized. At Salisbury State University in Maryland, the ad was ripped off the final layout page just hours before it was to be printed at command of the faculty advisor. Some papers informed me that while it was too late in the season this year they would be glad to run it next year.

While we're not sure yet how many student newspapers ran the ad, or are still going to run it (there are two I can't yet name, just in case), we do know that among those which did run it include:

U Tennessee at Chatanooga, TN
U Missouri at Rolla, MO
U Nebraska at Kearney, NE
SUNY at Binghampton, NY
Glendale Community C, AZ
U Wisconsin at River Falls, WI
Radford U at Radford, VA
Loyola College / Baltimore, MD
U New Orleans, LA
Bryant C at Smithfield, RI
De Anza C at Cupertino, CA
Providence C at Providence, RI
Salt Lake Community C, UT
Western Oregon State C / at Monmouth,OR
Northeastern U at Boston, MA

This suggests that the axiom about nothing being over until it's over is profound indeed. These are mid-level colleges and won't cause the same level of controversy we created last year. The papers in this list average print runs of 4,000. Readership would be about twice that, particularly when a CODOH ad is printed. That suggests that upwards of 150,000 college students, faculty and administrators read the text during March and April, in every case at a campus where in all likelihood no revisionist text on the Holocaust story had ever before seen the light of day.

We think one reason why this really last minute effort paid off so well is that this is the same list of newspapers we sent the Cole/Piper video to November last, along with a package of printed materials. We thought at the time that we would have a lot of college newspaper editors and their staffs scratching their heads over Thanksgiving and the Christmas holidays. There must have been plenty of back room talk about the video in many an editorial office, and when the ad showed up on their desks four months later they were somewhat prepared for it

By the way, the lady who originally offered to fund the three ads, if I could get them published, picked up the tab for the entire seventeen. May the gods bless her.

The Faurisson / Cole Affair.

This one has grown increasingly complicated for me and is now something of a small catastrophe. From what I gather, I've failed Henri Roques, I've failed Robert Faurisson, and now I've failed David Cole. That of course is in addition to Willis and Elizabeth and all those who are rooting for them.

Roques and I didn't correspond-before the Struthof robbery of Cole, but we certainly didn't have any problems. But Roques was unhappy that I did not run his letter charging Cole was inventing part of his story about the robbery. I wrote Roques explaining that I would run his account of the robbery in my next newsletter and in a coda asked him to send along what proof he had that Cole had lied about his experience at Struthof, which is what the charge really is, and which I would be willing to publish. Roques didn't respond to my letter.

Robert Faurisson wrote me outlining what he feels is my negligence or even unwillingness to publish the Roques letter and said he would have to "think about what to do." He suggested that Cole had manipulated me into running Cole's own long response to Faurisson's short letter in SR21 so that I would have to cut Roques's

letter from that issue. I wrote Faurisson to say that Cole did not know I would not run the Roques letter in SR21. Faurisson has continued to distribute his letter that says Cole did know, tho Faurisson has no way to know first hand that Cole knew, so it is only speculation.

I faxed Faurisson to remind him that I was planing to do a special publication to house his reply to Cole's reply to his original letter and to urge him to get the material to me by 20 April at the latest, or to inform me that under the pressure of all the other obligations he has that he had decided to not respond to Cole. I haven't heard from Faurisson since early April, and he doesn't answer my faxed letters.

For his part, Cole was more than annoyed, he was outraged over the couple or three paragraphs I wrote about him in my (undated) April letter and he wrote me the angriest and most personally insulting letter I have ever received. It's a real over-the-top missive which makes Willis Carto's insults appear the fulminations of an emasculate. It kinda hurt my feelings.

Cole was particularly out of sorts over my account of his not fulfilling his agreement to make a video for D&B productions about the physical evidence for the gas chambers and the consequences of that on the Campus Project and on my financial situation, by my characterization of his response to Faurisson's letter as "disrespectful," and my failure to defend him, Cole, against Faurisson's suggestion that Cole wants to exploit the Struthof robbery for money. To that point I want to say that it was my idea to get an interview with Cole after the robbery, not Coles'.

Cole raised other issues as well, all of which place me in boorish and contemptible light, and ended by breaking with me entirely, writing: "I don't wish to have anything more to do with 'D&B Productions.' Consider this letter a demand to sever my ties and dissolve the partnership."

Well, I agreed of course to this demand and am now the proud, sole owner of a *kaput* video production company which has many unsaleable revisionist videos. David and I still have some business odds and ends to clean up, which we're taking care of by fax and post. Maybe one day we'll kiss and make up.

I'm still distributing Cole's letter, "David Cole Replies to Henri Roques and Robert Faurisson." I described this letter last time out as Cole's 8 page reply; since then it has grown to be a 16-page reply. In that part of the "Reply" that replies to Roques, it sets the Struthof record straight from Cole's viewpoint. The more substantial part of the "Reply" is a critical look at some of Faurisson's work..

Some time ago I told Cole I hoped he was going to be very careful mounting a serious criticism of Faurisson and to not go off half-cocked because he was annoyed about one thing or another. Cole said: "Faurisson is not going to reply. Take my word for it." I took the implication to be that some of Faurisson's work is vulnerable to close examination. Why wouldn't that be? Scholars who are among the first in their field always run the highest risk of factual and imaginative error. Faurisson had the added burden, because of academic bigotry, of being denied what is so important to the scholar -- peer review.

In any event, send me a couple bucks and I'll send you Cole's 16-page "Reply." At the same time, please be informed that if you do send the "couple bucks" Cole will not get a single penny of that money. He asked me to make this very plain. Cole will receive no part of the "couple bucks." I will keep it all for myself.

For the first time in the 15 years I have associated with revisionists, I find myself standing on the dock, as it were, waving good-bye to one associate, one friend after another.

"So long Elizabeth Carto. So long Willis. Bye, Henri Roques. Have a good trip. So long Robert Faurisson. So long David Cole. It's been good to know ye, every one."

Break His Bones. The book is going fine. *Break His Bones* is a working title -- did I ever say that? Back in March, when I was going through my fit of *sturm und drang,* of that's how you spell it, I talked about sharing the working manuscript with those of you who contribute to helping me stay alive while I finish it. I've rather changed my mind. Shipping the manuscript around, or parts of it, is a good way to get too many cooks in the kitchen, particularly the way I write, so after some reflection I have decided against doing it.

On the other hand, if you believe you might wamt to make a substantial contribution toward helping me finish the manuscript, but want to see what I have first to reassure yourself that it is a worthy project, I will be glad to send it along -- for your eyes only. Roughly, the manuscript will have 33 chapters, 24 of which are finished or all but finished. The page count will be 250 - 300 pages when finished.

A San Francisco Examiner reporter called the day after the bombing of the Federal Building

in Oklahoma City. He wanted a little inside information on the "militias." Of course I would be one of the first people in America to ask. Anyone would think so. After all, I don't believe the gas chamber stories. When the reporter discovered I don't know anything whatever about the militias he asked me if there was something I would like to say about them. I convinced him that it would be immodest of me to chat up a reporter on a subject I am entirely ignorant of.

Afterwards it struck me that that must be the way many reporters approach "survivors." The survivor doesn't have to know anything real; the reporter isn't even particularly looking for something real. Anything will do, anything whatever -- any old memory, any old opinion -- so long as it's lurid and fits into the editorial guidelines of the company he works for.

Maybe I missed a good thing here. If I'd have given one interview about the militias to the Examiner, other reporters from other papers would have called to get their own story about the militias -- from a holocaust revisionist. What fun.

Letters

Carlos Porter ***on how to document collections of human skulls, document gassings anywhere, and document documents.***

I see that we are back in the land of "may have" that we once visited with Charles Provan.

This story about Struthof and Joseph Kramer is the same old crap that William L. Shirer dished up over 30 years ago. If Kramer's "confession" is supposed to mean anything, and if the "skull collection" is supposed to be a reality, then why doesn't somebody dig up the documents (or the skulls) and show them to us? The evidence is available; the only problem is that the transcript to the Belsen Trial costs 35 cents a page to photocopy, and it is 3,000 pages long.

William L. Shirer's reference to this story . . . is NMT 1, the Doctor's Trial, which is crazy, because Kramer was hanged in his own trial, the Belsen Trial.

. . . .

I think I have shown that none of these trials prove anything, because of the procedures used, and also because all defense evidence was simply ignored. But if we are really going to get all this old garbage hashed up again ("he gave me a bottle of salts. . . . I think they were salts of cyanide. . . .") then why not get the transcripts, write to the National Archives for the documents, and show them to us?

The NMT trials are available on microfilm. The cost 200 bucks. If somebody can pay for David to go to France for 2 weeks, why can't somebody pay to get the transcripts to these two trials, and then we can talk sensibly? For 1,500 bucks we can get an idea of what we are talking about.

The first question is, what is the source of a statement? Is it a document, or is it oral testimony? If it is oral testimony, I want to get it and read it, including the cross examination. If it is a document, I want to know what kind of document it is. Is it an "affidavit"? Is it a "copy"? Is it a "photocopy"? All authentic documents ought to be cross-referenced in any case, so authentic documents can be traced.

In any case, I want a photocopy of it so that I can see it, and I want to know whether it is a photocopy of an original, or the photocopy of another photocopy. I also want to know where the original is. Otherwise, this kind of discussion is utterly useless.

I am not impressed by J.C. Pressac or the quotation of odd phrases like *Gasraum, gaskammer, Material zur Vergasung*", etc., because J.C. Pressac's whole book on the crematories at Auschwitz is based on deliberate mistranslations of terms just like these. Pressac is a con-man, the smartest literary con-man of the 20th century. I have great respect for him -- as a con-man. It's an art form.

As I say, I don't know anything about the Belsen case except this; the transcript costs $1,200 plus shipping and insurance. The references for it are: National Archives, Military Reference Branch, Suitland (NNRMS), Office of the Judge Advocate General, Record Group 153, File 12-459: Trial of Joseph Kramer.

The reason it's so expensive is that nobody wants to see it.

Carl Hottelet ***on brain, heart, kidney and skull collections:***

This afternoon your SR 21 -- *Ave atque Vale!* -- came in. . . . Dave Cole's piece is well reasoned and well written . . . all depends, of course on whether or not what he writes is based on facts. I'm certain he believes it to be so. . . and he may be right, though I am constrained to say that stories about mad scientists with brain collections, heart collections, kidney collections, and skull collections have aroused in me an almost invincible skepticism. It will be interesting to see how Monsieur Docteur Professeur Faurisson, rebuts . . . if he does.

Don Hirsh ***on the Faurisson / Cole exchange.***

As Exalted Pundit of The Senator Joseph McCarthy Fan Club, my questions regarding holocaust revisionism were sometimes frustrated by what seemed to be a lack of objectivity on the part of exterminationists and revisionists alike. My impression was that if revisionists happened to [discover] evidence that supported the exterminationist premise, if only to a degree, they would fail to report it, a stance conducive to "proving" themselves correct, rather than pursuing the truth.

Thus, it was heartening to read the scholarly disagreement between Professor Faurisson and David Cole in your March issue. It was the best issue thus far.

Ideally, both men will remain above counter-productive egoistic factors in determining their views, and continue to regard the matter as a difference among friends.

Al Durette ***on David Cole, Robert Faurisson and was it "disrespectful?"***

I see that in Smith's Report, Supplement to #21, April 95, that you characterize David Cole's 16-page essay on Robert Faurisson as "disrespectful." I re-read Cole's essay carefully to see if I could find anything that seemed to me to be disrespectful, and I couldn't. David's statement on page 2, "many of the points Faurisson has made about Krema I are dangerously fraudulent" made me sit up, but the statement seems well supported by Faurisson's misrepresentations of the steam autoclaves as delousing chambers (discussed by Cole on page 3), and by Faurisson's substitution of "gas chambers" for "ovens" (p. 5) in his conversation with Mr. Michael of the Auschwitz Museum.

. . . there could conceivably be some non-fraudulent explanation of these two mattes. E.g., is it certain that the steam autoclaves are just that, or is there room for disagreement about what they are? Is it somehow possible that Mr. Michael made both statements, but that Faurisson found no opportunity to report the more interesting gas chamber statement until 17 years after it was made? (Or did Faurisson report it elsewhere, and has Cole been sloppy -- or fraudulent -- in not saying so?). Let Faurisson respond in detail to all of this so that we all might be enlightened.

If Cole feels that the evidence (only some of which he would have an opportunity to share in 16 pages, is overwhelming that these two matters could only be examples of fraud, then I see nothing disrespectful in his saying so. . . .

I hope you will take my comments in the friendly spirit in which they are offered.

Come to think of it, perhaps by "disrespectful you only meant to convey the [fact] that Cole's essay is not laudatory! (?)

Andrew Allen ***on one reason why it will benefit Willis Carto to see the Institute for Historical Review destroyed.***

Many revisionists wonder about the series of vicious personal attacks Willis Carto is making against long term revisionists like Ted O'Keefe, Mark Weber, and Bradley Smith as well as Carto's absurd claim that the IHR has been taken over by agents of the ADL. It is clear that the missing millions of the Farrel estate explain these attacks.

Jean Farrel was the granddaughter of Thomas Edison and was very wealthy. She had an estate of over $17,000,000. Much of the estate consisted of precious gems, gold coins and bearer stock certificates that were place in safe deposit boxes around the world.

All available evidence, including court records from North Carolina and Switzerland, make it clear that the Farrel Estate was meant for revisionism and the IHR. Only one or two percent of the 17 million ever went to the IHR. The rest has disappeared.

It appears that Willis Carto filed the minutes of various fictitious meetings of the Board of Directors of The Legion for the Survival of Freedom [the controlling legal entity for IHR and Noontide Press] which gave him authority to act as an agent of the IHR. The assets of the Farrel estate were distributed to Carto or his associates when the IHR tried to take Carto's deposition to obtain an accounting. Carto "took the 5th" on the grounds that his answers could lead to criminal prosecution or liability.

If the IHR is run legally and properly, then Carto will have to account for the millions of dollars that are missing. If the IHR is destroyed, Carto will have no one asking him for an accounting.

Sinister Foxx, Jr. ***on* Smith's Report, *on Smith himself, and on why Smith should be lynched by revisionists.***

You are the only editor I know who is not afraid to mention and describe in detail your failures, not only insignificant errors but major failures (example: the Rhode Island radio program). This is extremely refreshing and educational and [encourages] progress.

I love your position on Zuendel. He gets angry with me because like you I point out that nazis were anti-libertarians. Moreover, I stress they were [dumb], e.g., laying off 200,000 Polish teachers in September 1939 and in not dissolving collective farms in Ukraine, this last being the major reason they lost W.W.II. They were also brutal toward Jews and others.

I love your dissynchronous mixture of high-falutin' and erudite language with simple spoken language. Extremely refreshing technique

Re the University of Miami: You brilliantly turned defeat into a joke. From a historical perspective, and objectively and heartlessly, you should by lynched by revisionists. They returned your ad money to you, $288, and you generated $2,000,000 in research and educational funds for exterminationists. Why? Because your ad was stupid, particularly the one sentence I warned you about: ". . . the Museum displays no convincing proof whatever of homicidal gassing chambers, and no proof that even one individual was "gassed" in a German program of "genocide."

Because of this single sentence at the beginning of your ad, reasonable people did not read the rest of the text and you got no converts! Instead, this ad will, for decades, create new exterminationists backed by the Ziff millions.

James P. Hogan ***on why Hemingway's ex, reporter Martha Gellhorn, could report on "gas chambers" in September 1944 when revisionists claim the myth wasn't established until after the war.***

A major thrust of revisionist writers is that the suggestion of homicidal gas chambers was first made to State Department officials by Jewish activists during the war years, but rejected as unsubstantiated allegations. Attention is drawn to the fact that no reference is made to them by the otherwise excellently informed Allied intelligence services, Red Cross, or Vatican agents. Neither are they mentioned in the diaries or memoirs of war leaders such as Churchill and Eisenhower. The myth was shaped, we are told, after the war during the Nuremberg trials, and subsequently became the official historical line.

Enclosed is a copy of an article titled "Death of a Dutch Town," by the war correspondent Martha Gellhorn, which appeared in Colliers magazine in October, 1944. On the third page there appears a description of gas chambers operating just as has been later depicted. The questions that arise, of course are: (1) If none of the Allied leaders or intelligence services knew of such events in the middle of 1944, how did this reporter know? And (2) How could the SS guard have described such things at this time if they weren't happening, and the story wasn't fabricated until much later?

(SR has a photocopy of this article. The text is clear, the photos are unreadable, but are not pertinent. If you want to look at it drop me a post card saying so.)

E.K.S. Judge ***on the weakness of confrontation and violence in changing men's thinking.***

There is a sadness about your "last" newsletter that haunts me. . . . Maybe God is trying to tell us (at times like these) that we have unknowingly finished one phase and are entering (or should be) another. These are days of Resurrection: prime time if there ever was a prime time. We must make good use of it.

Put your thinking cap on, Bradley. Better yet, open your heart. Do you think God is not looking for good men at a time laden with such favorable [possibilities]?

Jews are worried. Worried people are open to suggestion. Isn't there some effective way of reminding them that Christians are commanded not to retaliate, for that's the realm of God? . . . They have painted themselves into a corner and so have we to a certain extent.

I'm glad to learn you re "not going away." There is plenty of work to be done but maybe of a different kind. Good forces don't always flow along in rational ways. At least they don't seem rational to us of finite mind.

There is a lot of work crying to be done among the Muslims. They are not good at the art of informal, communication. Enclosed is a sample of a Muslim publication on the eastern seaboard [*New Trend*, Kingsville, MD]. Could you cooperate with Kaukab Siddique [it's editor] in some way? He has a universal spirit, courage and a (non-violent) drive to change things in a global way.

When Kaukab was a boy he noticed his father emulating Hitler, to the point of growing a similar mustache. His father saw Hitler as the only force resisting global economic control . . . . Interesting that that feeling should arise in far off Pakistan fifty yeas ago.

Jesus Christ gave us a much more practical suggestion than Hitler's [of confrontation and violence]: care for one another and your problems disappear. . . . Our war today is a spiritual war and using negative forces in combat is taking it out of its rightful realm. The new Jeruslaem mentioned in Scripture is not a turbulent

place on the map of the eastern Mediterranean Sea. It is a change in men's hearts. . . .

Let's have some of the "good news." Not just the bad. There is plenty of it out there. The young, progressive, "sassy" Blacks .(like L. Farrakhan) are part of it

Mary Lucas ***on the necessity for patience and understanding and the dangers of the "hardening of outlook" and of friendship among revisionists.***

Having just leaned about the "clash" between David Cole and Robert Faurisson, I feel very sad and concerned. . . .

The hardening of one's outlook on the world or one's explanation of specific events may have various causes. One of them must be a lack of sophistication when it comes to dealing with the world. A well known example, I suppose, is Luther. He concluded his indictment of the Catholic Church before his judge, the emperor Charles V, with "Here I am, I cannot help it, God help me," meaning, `I have come to the conclusion that reform is necessary and my good conscience does not allow me to consider any compromises. . . .

Given the lack of direct experience with the human and political background [in Europe] in those times, I wonder if David Cole thinks of all the right questions to ask in order not to be misled. The literature of the times, especially the original state sponsored educational writings, show very clearly the profile of the [Nazi] ideology. The indoctrination was idealistic, simplistic and in many ways stupid in my view, but it has nothing in common with the image projected today. That does not mean however that crimes were not committed by the state and particular people. It is just the whole wrapping of the atrocity stories that looks so disingenuous.

If empathy with the victims [plays] a role in David Cole's assessment of the documentation, that is perfectly comprehensible, but so is Faurisson's bitterness when asked to give more evidence than his opponents. The victims of yesterday have been the masters since 1945 -- throughout the Western World. When emotions are involved, everybody is liable to err and there is just no antidote to it but a comparable emotional involvement, which in the case of this issue would be the feeling that the search for the truth is an important human value.

If people come together over a common goal like [revisionism], they tend to develop friendships and a warm feeling of solidarity and purpose, and their closeness may increase under outside pressure. But I think that the impression of friendship is a danger for the common undertaking. The nearer you feel as friends, the more agreement you expect. Worse even, the more the emotional involvement grows in the group and around the project, the more the issue is liable to become one of faith.

Revisionism has had and still has to struggle so hard not so much because the issue of the history of the Jews under the Nazis feeds into some material interests but because the historical account itself is largely one of faith. It is a question of faith not only for those who were victimized and those who identify with them as second-generation survivors, but also for all those who have integrated into their picture of the world this particular tragedy as it has been presented to them since their early childhood days.

So while I would plead with David Cole to have patience with Faurisson's occasional closures (of mind), taking into account that the other side has been strictly dogmatic for the past 50 years, I cannot agree more with Cole when he reminds Faurisson of the need to continue explaining one's insights to others and not ask them just to believe in one's own veridiction.

Business.

I'm in roughly the same situation I was this time last month, but I have something of a grasp on it. I've simplified Smith's Report so that I can finish it in three working sessions rather than, as in the past, 10 sessions and oftentimes more.

I've cleared my desk of several projects I was contemplating trying to do and am increasingly focusing on the book manuscript. I still have about 90 days before everything starts to implode with my creditors. In May I'm going to do what I have to do to stay ahead of the pack.

At the same time, I have a new concept for the Campus Project, one that I think I can use to lever the various mainstream First Amendment organizations to stop evading us -- which to date they have been very successful in doing. I think I have an idea for them that they are not going to be able to refuse. It's very straight forward, less expensive than buying advertising space, and simple to implement. I don't see why, if there is not some fresh, unexpected catastrophe in the meantime, I won't be able to take a run at it early in the fall.

Best,

Bradley